

### REMARKS

The Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Examiner's Office Action dated April 16, 2008. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following comments.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 9 are amended, and claims 4 and 7 are canceled. Accordingly, Claims 1, 3, 5-6 and 8-15 are pending in the present application.

Claims 5 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for the reasons set forth in paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Action. The foregoing amendments to the claims overcome the indefiniteness rejection by providing antecedent basis for "the short circuit line" by amending claim 1 to include the subject matter of claim 4 and amending claim 9 to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention without adding any new matter. It is believed that claims 5 and 9 are fully definite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,239,765 to Johnson et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Johnson"). Claims 1, 3, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0017624 to Nagano et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Nagano"). These rejections are respectfully traversed. But, in an effort to advance the prosecution of this application, claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 4 thereby rendering these rejections moot. Applicants provide the following distinguishing remarks:

Johnson is directed to an asymmetric dipole antenna assembly. Johnson fails to disclose “the feed point is positioned in substantially center of an electrical length of the first radiator and the electric waves are released omni-directionally” as recited in claim 1 of the present invention. Referring to Fig. 6 and the related description of Johnson, the signal feed point 32 is located in the center of the high frequency band resonator (26d) and the low-frequency band resonator (26e), which is entirely different from the claimed invention that the feed point is positioned in substantially center of an electrical length of the first radiator (e.g., a high-frequency band resonator). That is, Johnson discloses a signal feed point that is positioned between the high- and low-frequency band resonant portions. Johnson does not mention the word “center” in its disclosure and the feed point is illustrated as between two different resonant portions. Consequently, Johnson does not disclose a feed point that is positioned in substantially center of an electrical length of a first radiator, as required by the claimed invention.

Nagano is directed to an antenna unit and portable radio system comprising an antenna unit. Nagano fails to disclose “a short circuit pin for grounding the antenna; and a short circuit line for releasing the supplied signals partially, the short circuit line being positioned between the short circuit pin and the feed point and having a half of the first radiator’s electrical length wherein the feed point is positioned in substantially center of an electrical length of the first radiator and the electric waves are released omni-directionally”, as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application. Referring to paragraph [0031] of Nagano, the antenna current is induced in the antenna element at the transmitting frequency, while another antenna current is induced in the parasitic element at the receiving frequency by the spatial coupling between the antenna element and the

parasitic element, and therefore, a wider bandwidth can be obtained without provision of a matching circuit and also expansion of a parts packaging space on a board and reduction in the number of packaged parts can be achieved.

As mentioned above, in Nagano, the antenna element and the parasitic element are necessarily requested and the matching circuit is not necessary. However, in the claimed invention, the feed point is positioned in substantially center of electrical length of the first radiator and the electric waves are released omni-directionally. Accordingly, Nagano is entirely different from the claimed invention.

Claims 4-5 and 7-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,936,587 to Gudilev et al. (hereafter referred to as “Gudilev”). Claims 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,466,176 to Maoz et al. (hereafter referred to as “Maoz”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As mentioned above, Johnson fails to teach, suggest or disclose “the feed point is oositioned in substantially center of an electrical length of the first radiator and the electric waves are released omni-directionally.” Since the claimed invention is entirely different from Johnson, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have considered the ground connection 34 and the conductor trace 26a of Johnson as corresponding to a short circuit pin for grounding the antenna and a short circuit line of the present invention. Gudilev also fails to disclose or suggest such features. Consequently, Applicants believe that the claimed invention is not obvious over any combination of Johnson or Gudilev. Accordingly, Applicants believe that independent Claim 1 is not obvious in view of any reference cited by

Examiner, and that Claim 1, as amended, is patentable over the prior art of record.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 6 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

With respect to claims 5 and 9-14, since the claims are dependent, either directly or indirectly on Claim 1, we believe that claims 5 and 9-14 are patentable as the same reason with Claim 1.

For the above stated reasons, it is submitted that all of the claims are allowable over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this application be passed to issuance with claims 1, 3, 5-6, and 9-15.

Should the Examiner believe that a conference would advance the prosecution of this application, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Catherine M. Voorhees  
Registration No. 33,074  
VENABLE LLP  
P.O. Box 34385  
Washington, DC 20043-9998  
Telephone: (202) 962-4800  
Telefax: (202) 962-8300

Date: August 15, 2008

CMV/elw

::ODMA\PCDOCS\DC2DOCS\977357\1